

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

MICHAEL C. STERNBERG,
Plaintiff,

v.

SHELLEY WARNECK, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-01466-APG-EJY

ORDER

MICHAEL C. STERNBERG,
Plaintiff,

v.

SHELLEY WARNECK, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-02022-APG-EJY

Pending before the Court is Defendants Gina Policastri and Lonich Patton Ehrlich Policastri, PC's Motion to Stay Discovery Pending Resolution of Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (the "Policastri Motion"). ECF No. 150. The following Defendants join in the Policastri Motion: (1) the Supreme Court of California, Chief Justice of California, California Court of Appeal Sixth Appellate District, the Honorable Mary J. Greenwood, Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara, the Honorable Beth A.R. McGowen, the Honorable Brooke Blecher, the Honorable Roberta S. Hayashi, the Honorable Cindy Hendrickson, and the Honorable Thomas E. Kuhnle (ECF No. 151); (2) the County of Santa Clara, Erica Doerr, Russell Davis, Brett Moore, Jeff Rosen, Jay Boyarsky, Tracy Tefertiller, Maria Gershenovich, and Rob Imobersteg (ECF No. 152); (3) Nevada Attorney General Aaron Ford, William Scott, Gina Lovero, Dave Monroe, Brent Foster, Christine Jones Brady, and Daniel Ulloa (ECF No. 157); and (4) Michelle Brenot (ECF No. 163). On May 3, 2024, Defendants Tristan Aeschleman and Adames & Ash LLP, together with Defendant Shelley Warneck, filed a Joint Motion to Stay Discovery Pending this Court's Ruling on Motions to Dismiss (ECF No. 159). These Defendants also joined the Policastri Motion (ECF No. 160).

On May 9, 2024 Plaintiff Michael Sternberg filed a Response to the Policastri Motion to Stay Discovery. ECF No. 164. In the Response, Mr. Sternberg states he does not concede any legal or factual arguments raised in the Policastri Motion, but “agree[s] that discovery should be stayed until more is known about the [C]ourt’s view on the pending motions to dismiss.” *Id* at 1. Mr. Sternberg further states that he wants to focus on alleged “unconstitutional California court rules, state statutes, and void orders.” *Id.* at 2. On May 17, 2024, Mr. Sternberg filed a Response to the Joint Motion to Stay Discovery filed by Aeschleman, Warneck, and Adames & Ash LLP. ECF No. 172. That Response states Mr. Sternberg does not object to a short term stay of discovery while the Motions to Dismiss are pending. *Id.* at 1.

The Court finds Mr. Sternberg does not oppose the Policastri Motion and, for that reason, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion to Stay Discovery at ECF No. 150 is GRANTED.

The Court further finds Mr. Sternberg does not oppose the Joint Motion to Stay Discovery filed by Defendants Tristan Aeschleman, Adames & Ash LLP, and Shelley Warneck. Accordingly, IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Joint Motion to Stay Discovery at ECF No. 159 is GRANTED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all discovery is stayed as to all matters asserted in this action until such time as the Court issues its order or orders resolving the pending Motions to Dismiss.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if the Court’s order(s) on pending Motions to Dismiss do not resolve this action in its entirety, the remaining parties **must** file a status report no later than **fourteen (14) days** after the Court issues its order(s). The status report **must** identify what claims remain to be resolved and what discovery **must** be conducted on what proposed schedule relating to those claims.

Dated this 21st day of May, 2024.


 ELAYNA J. YOUCHAK
 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE